



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,997	03/12/2004	Dwight McKee	382/9-1788	6866

28147 7590 06/23/2005

WILLIAM J. SAPONE
COLEMAN SUDOL SAPONE P.C.
714 COLORADO AVENUE
BRIDGE PORT, CT 06605

EXAMINER

MCCORMICK EWOLDT, SUSAN BETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1654

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/798,997

Applicant(s)

MCKEE ET AL.

Examiner

Susan B. McCormick-Ewoldt

Art Unit

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5 and 10-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>January 10, 2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

500

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I and species elected, *Rhodiola rosea*, in the reply filed on April 26, 2005 is acknowledged. Because Applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 5 and 10-23 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on April 24, 2005.

Claims Pending

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 will be examined on the merits and solely in regards to the elected species.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1-3, 7-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krotzer (US 2001/0008641)

Krotzer (US 2001/0008641) teaches a composition that contains theobromine, calcium, chromium, chromium picolinate, chromium polynicotinate, magnesium, potassium, cocoa and cinnamon in the amounts claimed, and can comprise clear solutions to provide a sense of well-being and tranquility ([0017]- [0021], [0026], [0078]; TABLE C). Krotzer meets the limitations of claim 1 and thus anticipates the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1654

Claims 1, 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mann *et al.* (US 2004/0005368 A1).

Mann *et al.* (US 2004/0005368) teaches a composition that suppresses the appetite consisting of theobromine, salts such as lithium, sodium, potassium, magnesium and calcium and chromium chloride. In addition, Mann *et al.* disclose formulations to be administered in the form of tablets, coated tablets, powders, capsules, syrups or suspensions. ([0029], [0031], [0089], [0113], [0115], [0120]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the Examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krotzer (US 2001/0008641) and Winston *et al.* (US 2003/0008048).

Krotzer (US 2001/0008641) discloses a composition that contains theobromine, calcium, chromium picolinate, chromium polynicotinate, magnesium, cocoa and cinnamon in the amounts claimed to provide a sense of well-being and tranquility ([0017]- [0021]). Krotzer does not disclose the extract of *Rhodiola rosea*.

Winston *et al.* (US 2003/0008048) disclose the use of *Rhodiola rosea* in a composition that gives a sense of emotional and psychological well being ([0028], [0040], [0054]).

Art Unit: 1654

These references show that it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to use the claimed ingredients in compositions that improve mood enhancement and energy. It is well known that it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two or more ingredients each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition which is useful for the same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. *In re Pinten*, 459 F.2d 1053, 173 USPQ 801 (CCPA 1972); *In re Susi*, 58 CCPA 1074, 1079-80; 440 F.2d 442, 445; 169 USPQ 423, 426 (1971); *In re Crockett*, 47 CCPA 1018, 1020-21; 279 F.2d 274, 276-277; 126 USPQ 186, 188 (1960).

Based on the disclosure by these references that these substances are used in compositions to improve mood enhancement and energy, an artisan of ordinary skill would have a reasonable expectation that a combination of the substances would also be useful in creating compositions to suppress appetites and improve mood enhancement and energy. Therefore, the artisan would have been motivated to combine the claimed ingredients into a single composition. No patentable invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients. See *In re Sussman*, 1943 C.D. 518; *In re Huellmantel* 139 USPQ 496; *In re Crockett* 126 USPQ 186.

The references also do not specifically teach the ingredients in the amounts claimed by Applicant. The amount of a specific ingredient in a composition is clearly a result effective parameter that a person of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. Optimization of parameters is a routine practice that would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ. It would have been customary for an artisan of ordinary skill to determine the optimal amount of each ingredient in order to best achieve the desired results. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, this optimization of ingredient amount would have been obvious at the time of Applicant's invention.

The references taken together teach the claimed ingredients can be used in a composition to suppress appetites and improve mood enhancement and energy. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect that the ingredients used in the references would be used in creating compositions to suppress appetites and improve mood enhancement and energy. Based on this reasonable expectation of success, a person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make modify the teachings of the references.

Art Unit: 1654

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mann *et al.* (US 2004/0005368).

Mann *et al.* (US 2004/0005368) disclose a composition that suppresses the appetite consisting of theobromine, salts such as lithium, sodium, potassium, magnesium and calcium and chromium chloride. In addition, Mann *et al.* disclose formulations to be administered in the form of tablets, coated tablets, powders, capsules, syrups or suspensions. ([0029], [0031], [0089], [0113], [0115], [0120].

The references also do not specifically teach the ingredients in the amounts claimed by Applicant. The amount of a specific ingredient in a composition is clearly a result effective parameter that a person of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. Optimization of parameters is a routine practice that would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ. It would have been customary for an artisan of ordinary skill to determine the optimal amount of each ingredient in order to best achieve the desired results. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, this optimization of ingredient amount would have been obvious at the time of Applicant's invention.

Summary

No claim is allowed.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Susan B. McCormick-Ewoldt whose telephone number is (571) 272-0981. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 6:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell, can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The official fax number for the group is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 1654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sbme

Susan D. Cole
6-22-05
SUSAN COLE
PRIMARY EXAMINER